

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

PIERRE LAVI,

Plaintiff,

-v-

MUFG BANK, *et al.*,

Defendants.

22-CV-3167 (JPO)

ORDER

J. PAUL OETKEN, District Judge:

Pro se plaintiff Pierre Lavi has, since this Court’s orders of dismissal (ECF Nos. 41 and 42), filed a series of letters that appear to be requests for reconsideration (ECF Nos. 43-47). “A motion for reconsideration is an extraordinary remedy to be employed sparingly in the interests of finality and conservation of scarce judicial resources.” *Drapkin v. Mafco Consol. Grp., Inc.*, 818 F. Supp. 2d 678, 695 (S.D.N.Y. 2011) (citation and quotations omitted). To prevail, the movant must demonstrate either (i) an intervening change in controlling law; (ii) the availability of new evidence; or (iii) the need to correct clear error or prevent manifest injustice. *Jacob v. Duane Reade, Inc.*, 293 F.R.D. 578, 580–81 (S.D.N.Y. 2013) (citation omitted); *see also Cioce v. County of Westchester*, 128 Fed. App’x 181, 185 (2d Cir. 2005) (“Generally, motions for reconsideration are not granted unless the moving party can point to controlling decisions or data that the court overlooked—matters, in other words, that might reasonably be expected to alter the conclusion reached by the court.”).

Having reviewed the record and Mr. Lavi’s letters, the Court concludes that it overlooked neither a controlling issue of law nor a crucial fact in the record. Plaintiff’s motion to reconsider is therefore denied.

Because this case is no longer active, Mr. Lavi is directed to stop filing related materials, and is notified that the Court will no longer docket additional motions for reconsideration or requests for relief not permitted under the law.

The Clerk of the Court is directed to mail a copy of this order to Mr. Lavi at 10 Auserehl Ct., Huntington, NY 11743.

SO ORDERED.

Dated: January 28, 2025
New York, New York



J. PAUL OETKEN
United States District Judge